



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

## Edinburgh Research Explorer

### Words beyond meaning in Mapuche language ideology

**Citation for published version:**

Course, M 2018, 'Words beyond meaning in Mapuche language ideology', *Language and Communication*, vol. 63, pp. 9-14. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langcom.2018.03.007>

**Digital Object Identifier (DOI):**

[10.1016/j.langcom.2018.03.007](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langcom.2018.03.007)

**Link:**

[Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer](#)

**Document Version:**

Peer reviewed version

**Published In:**

Language and Communication

**General rights**

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

**Take down policy**

The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact [openaccess@ed.ac.uk](mailto:openaccess@ed.ac.uk) providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



## Words Beyond Meaning in Mapuche Language Ideology

Magnus Course, University of Edinburgh

This paper is about a fundamentally interesting question, and a question which I feel is pertinent to the scope of this special issue as a whole. Unfortunately, although the question is interesting, I don't have a particularly concise or satisfying answer, in fact in many ways I don't really have much of an answer at all. As I hope will become clear, this is partly down to problems with certain assumptions inherent in the question itself, but also because the object of the question itself hovers around an ambiguity, a misalignment, an equivocation (Viveiros de Castro, 2004*b*). This is very much a first step towards thinking about what an answer might look like, and why, despite everything, we need to ask the question in the first place. So what's the question? Well, it's a deceptively simple one: what is the difference between the Mapuche language, Mapudungun, and Spanish? Perhaps the term "difference" is a give-away to the approach that I'll be taking and the theoretical perspective from which much of my thinking on this topic has emerged. For in using the term "difference" I'm following in the footsteps of a particular genealogy of anthropologists - the triumvirate of Wagner (1975), Strathern (1980), and Viveiros de Castro (2004*a*) - who, each in their own different ways, have persistently asked the question of whether our difference is the same kind of difference as theirs, with "ours" and "theirs" themselves being relative constructs.<sup>1</sup> This kind of approach has congealed and spread and is sometimes located under the term "comparative relativism" (Jensen, 2011). As the editors of this issue note, it is perhaps surprising how relatively little engagement scholars working within this approach have given to questions of language. From the perspective of this approach, the question is really a question about a question: are we asking whether Mapudungun and Spanish are two different kinds of the same thing? Or are we asking if they are two different things? My rather unsatisfactory answer is that both questions are valid and pertinent to my Mapuche interlocutors' thinking on this topic.

At first glance, this kind of debate about linguistic difference might appear to come under the scope of language ideology (Kroskrity, 2000; Woolard & Schieffelin, 1994). But perhaps the question goes a little deeper than that, for we might ask whether language ideology actually skates around the question of what language actually is. One of the critiques of cultural relativism emerging from the kind of approach outlined above is that it leaves unchallenged the unitary identity of the "real" world; distinct cultures are simply different visions of a singular, shared reality, a reality or "world" that is assumed as a given (cf. Holbraad & Pedersen, 2017). We might want to transpose this argument to the realm of language and ask whether the questions we ask about language ideologies (or indeed the entire concept itself) are simply different takes on a singular, given, unitary phenomenon that is language? For if we follow through to their logical ends

---

<sup>1</sup> I am a disciple, albeit an inconstant one (Course, 2010).

some of the ideas people hold, we might be forced to at the very least re-consider the assumption that “language” is a self-evident, singular thing in the world. I return to this possibility in the conclusion, but for now let me start with some background information about the rural Mapuche people with whom I work and about the linguistic context.

### **The Mapuche Nation and Mapudungun**

The Mapuche are an indigenous group of approximately one million people, most of whom live in Chile, but some of whom live across the cordillera in western Argentina. The Mapuche heartland is the Eighth, Ninth, and Tenth regions of southern Chile, although due to urban migration, over half of the Mapuche population is now resident in the Chilean capital, Santiago. My own research was in rural communities sandwiched between Lago Budi and the Pacific Ocean in southern Chile’s Ninth Region. People there survive through a mixture of government subsidy and subsistence agriculture, and don’t live in villages, but in scattered, often quite isolated homesteads (Course, 2011; Di Giminiani, 2012; González, 2016).

Nearly all of the adults with whom I’ve worked are bilingual in both Spanish and Mapudungun.<sup>2</sup> There are a few monolingual Mapudungun speakers, and significantly more monolingual Spanish speakers. This maps roughly onto axes of both gender and age, i.e. young people are more likely to speak just Spanish than older people, and women are more likely to speak just Mapudungun than men. These days, although one will hear conversations in Mapudungun on a daily basis, most day to day interaction is carried out in Spanish. Thus although Spanish is referred to in Mapudungun as *winkadungun*, “white people’s language,” it is deeply and firmly embedded in contemporary rural Mapuche life and has been fully embraced by Mapuche poets, musicians, activists, and politicians (Crow, 2013).

### **Mapudungun and Ritual**

Despite, or perhaps because of, this positive and creative embracing of Spanish, I was frequently struck during my years in southern Chile by the absolute insistence of the people with whom I lived that certain practices must be carried out in Mapudungun, not Spanish. These practices include funeral orations (*amulpüllin*), meetings for organizing the ritual sport of *palin* (*tramun*), and meetings for organizing the great *ngillatun* fertility ritual, and the prayers in the ritual itself. All of these practices correspond roughly to what is referred to in some contexts as *wimtum* “Mapuche customs or traditions”, and in other contexts as *ad mapu*, “the way or aspect of the world”. Let me give three brief examples of the debates to which language choice in these contexts gives rise:

---

<sup>2</sup> The genetic relationship of Mapudungun to other Amerindian languages is an issue of no little controversy and as such is probably best thought of as a linguistic isolate. Recent studies of Mapudungun include Golluscio (2006); Smeets (2008); and Zúñiga (2000).

Alfredo was a young man who, like many young Mapuche people, had spent quite a few years in Santiago. He was the son of the local *lonko*, or headman, and was the child of the polygynous *lonko*'s lead wife or *unan kure*. This made Alfredo the most likely candidate to succeed his father, and Alfredo's desire to organize a game of *palin* was understood by many as an opportunity for him to demonstrate his capacity to fulfil this role. *Palin* is a sport somewhat resembling field hockey, but played on a very long and narrow pitch. Its historical importance to Mapuche society, from at least the sixteenth century to the present, cannot be overestimated. I've argued elsewhere that part of its continuing importance and relevance relies upon a kind of fractally-recursive structure, in which the game and the exchanges surrounding it are understood as a nested series of binary relationships (Course, 2011). And it is here, I believe, that the genius of *palin* lies: it simultaneously encompasses and constructs a series of relations of alterity that occur at a number of distinct levels. This capacity to create and open up these distinct kinds of relations to distinct kinds of potential affines that has assured its longevity and continuing relevance to Mapuche people. It is this importance that makes the act of organizing a match of *palin* such a delicate and fraught task, one which usually only the most verbally precocious will take on. However, in this case, there were several doubts raised about Alfredo's capacity to take on the role of headman, the most frequently voiced of which was his perceived inability to speak Mapudungun fluently. "How can you be a *lonko* if you can't speak?" said one woman. But when the day of the meeting to organize the game of *palin* arrived, Alfredo confidently conducted the entirety of proceedings in Mapudungun, with both fluency and eloquence. With the benefit of hindsight, none of us should have been surprised. He was, after all, the son of a monolingual Mapudungun-speaking mother. The point I want to draw from this is the twofold one that, firstly, *lonko* have to speak Mapudungun, and secondly, that meetings concerned with *palin*, have to be carried out in Mapudungun.

A second example comes from the funeral of Maria Neculhual, the wife of one of my adoptive "uncles" or *malle*. The central component of traditional Mapuche funerals is the *amulpüllin*, literally, "the making go of the spirit" (Course, 2007). This is a series of discourses about the deceased, performed by two orators or *wenpin*. The discourses are basically composed of a series of mutual greetings, introductions, and then a lengthy biography of the deceased. This biographical component of the orations, the *nutramtun*, is said to "complete" the person, and allow their spirit to move on from the world of the living. Once the two principal orators have performed this biography of the deceased, other mourners are able to add their own recollections of the deceased, maybe pointing things out of which the two orators were unaware. Now in some cases, these mourners may not be fluent in Mapudungun, maybe they were raised in the city, or in some cases they may not even be Mapuche people at all and it is therefore considered acceptable for them to give their accounts of the deceased in Spanish. I had never, however, in the several funerals I've attended over the years, heard the principal orators speak in Spanish. But in the case of Maria, Juan, one of the two *wenpife* lead orators, chose to perform the *nutramtun* in Spanish. Now Juan is perfectly capable of performing such a discourse in Mapudungun – it is his first language and he has done so many times before. In this instance, as he explained to me afterwards, he chose to speak in Spanish as many of Maria's grandchildren

could not understand Mapudungun and he thought – to my mind quite reasonably - they had every right to understand what was being said of their grandmother. However, Juan's decision caused upset and consternation among many. Even people who themselves couldn't fully understand Mapudungun were mortified that the *amulpüllün* had been performed in Spanish.

A third example can be drawn from protracted negotiations surrounding marriage transactions, *mafun*. My friend Claudio described to me the three kinds of *mafun* that were common during his childhood in the 1960s: *fücha mafun*, “big payment,” *pichi mafun*, “little payment,” and *ayuwunchi mafun*, “compensation payment.” These different kinds of marriage payments and ceremonies corresponded to different social classes within Mapuche society. Here I describe the negotiations surrounding *fücha mafun*, the “big payment,” the basic template for all marriage transactions. On the assigned day the groom would leave his house early in the morning accompanied by his parents, siblings, paternal uncles, and close friends. The group would not go directly to the bride's father's house, as to do so would be considered “disrespectful” (*yewelay*). Instead they would go to the house of a close patrilineal relative of the bride's father, referred to as the *rangiñelwe*, “the halfway person/place.” By not going straight to his counterpart's house, the groom's father was demonstrating *yewenwen*, a condition of heightened respect, that typifies relationships between bride's and groom's parents. Eventually the *rangiñelwe* would lead the groom's party to the bride's father's house and the negotiations would begin in earnest. A man and woman from each side would act as *ngillandungufe* (translatable as “affinal speakers” or “purchasing speakers”), whose role was to negotiate and organize the payment of animals and other goods. Each negotiator was in turn backed up by an *afkadi* (literally “facing the back”), who stood behind them and was responsible for reminding them of the various requests and offers of each party. These negotiations could last for upwards of two hours. This elaborate form of brideprice transaction rarely occurs today. Local people explained to me that this was due to the fact that “We're all too poor now.” There is no longer any elaborated distinction between “classes” of Mapuche people, and nobody is rich enough to engage in the type of transaction of multiple animals described above. Nevertheless, nearly every marriage is still accompanied by some kind of exchange payment, albeit in a much reduced form. My friend José, who married in the 1980s told me that two months after he had “taken” his wife, he was given some money by his patrilineal relatives in order to pay *mafun*. He bought a cow and, accompanied by his patrilineal relatives and friends, took it to his wife's father's house in Huapi. There they killed the animal and had a big party with lots of wine. José did this out of “respect” to his father-in-law. However, his primary concern at the time was neither getting married nor the possibility of his father-in-law's disapproval, but rather, whether years living in Santiago would have eroded his Mapudungun beyond the requisite level to perform competently the *mafun* discourses. For as with funerals and games of *palin*, it was unthinkable to carry out any kind of marriage negotiation in anything but Mapudungun.

### **Language, Hierarchy, and Force**

These examples are but three of many that demonstrate the absolute insistence that certain practices be performed in Mapudungun, not Spanish. So the question is why? Given that the vast majority of people in these contexts also speak Spanish, and indeed as we saw from the second example, are more likely to not understand Mapudungun than they are to not understand Spanish, why the importance attached to Mapudungun here? The most immediate answer is that the different languages are associated with different values. This kind of answer is fairly obvious and one could fill a library with books by sociolinguists and linguistic anthropologists making this point for almost every multilingual context in the world. In the Mapuche context such an answer would take the following form: Spanish is the language of the Chilean state, of Mapuche people's engagement with that state, and one could even go as far as to say that Spanish is, for Mapuche people, the language of "modernity" whatever that might be. Mapudungun, on the other hand, is the language of Mapuche people alone, of Mapuche solidarity, of "traditional" Mapuche practices, and the continuity of Mapuche existence. So put another way, we could say that Spanish and Mapudungun index different kinds of identities and thereby different aspects of the person. And these identities are hierarchically ranked, so in some contexts such as engagement with Chilean bureaucracy, formal education, and employment Spanish is understood as the more appropriate and superior language, as it is the aspect of the person as full Chilean citizen which comes to the fore. In other contexts, this hierarchy is reversed, thus in the practices described above, it is the "Mapuche" identity of the person which comes to the fore, thus Mapudungun is hierarchically valued over and above Spanish (cf. Bourdieu, 1982; Hill, 1986). I should stress that this hierarchy is context dependent (Woolard, 1985); I have seen some people ridiculed for their inability to speak Spanish, and others ridiculed for their inability to speak Mapudungun.

Now as mentioned above, this kind of argument will be immediately familiar from any number of multilingual situations pretty much anywhere in the world. And I don't think it is wrong. Indeed, I think it is adequate as a *partial* explanation of what is going on in the Mapuche context described above, but I stress, only a partial one. For this kind of sociolinguistic explanation only really addresses the question of the relationships between different languages and different identities; it leaves unanswered the fundamental question of what a language actually is according to local language ideology. Languages remain in a perfect state of ontological equivalence with people simply hanging values and identities on them, like coats on a peg. I think a step in the right direction can be found in the work of Webb Keane (2006). Keane's concept of semiotic ideology opens up a series of questions about the nature of what language is. Thus the Protestants in Keane's landmark study strive to reveal their inner "sincerity" through language as unmediated as possible. Yet Keane's insights can be pushed further and recent engagement by Jon Bialecki reveals that such an emphasis on the revelation of a sincere inner voice is simply the figure to a ground constituted by an ideology of language emerging from external, frequently diabolical sources (Bialecki, 2011). Thus Bialecki identifies both "centrifugal" and "centripetal" takes on the nature of language co-existing within the language ideology of the North American Evangelical Christians with whom he worked. The key point is simply that any given instance of language ideology may be heterogeneous, complex, and

even contradictory. But rather than follow Bialecki's investigation of heterogeneity and multiplicity in the context of a single language, what might such an approach reveal when applied to a multilingual situation? Could it be that different ideologies adhere to different languages? Or to put it another way, could it be that different languages are understood to be fundamentally different kinds of things? This is what I suspect to be at least partly the case in the Mapuche context, and my (admittedly highly speculative) suggestion is that Spanish and Mapudungun are not perceived simply as "equivalent" languages to which different identities and values are attached, but rather, are perceived as fundamentally different kinds of things.

Put bluntly, Spanish, like other non-Mapuche languages, is understood as an arbitrary and fungible system of representation. Mapudungun, on the other hand, is understood as deeply and fundamentally attached to the very fabric of the world.<sup>3</sup> Spanish is to Mapudungun as symbol is to index, to put it crudely. This is probably an overstatement, and there are many bits of counter-evidence which do indeed suggest a certain degree of ontological equivalence between the two. For example, they are both metalinguistically classified as "speech," *dungun*, so Spanish is *winkadungun*, "white people's speech" and Mapudungun is "the speech of the land." So both are identified as speech. But there's a clue here, even in what appears to be an equivalence, of a fundamental difference. Spanish, "white people's speech" is associated with a particular kind of person; Mapudungun, "the speech of the land" is not, it is associated with the very land itself, a key clue to its ontological divergence from Spanish. I've written elsewhere in rather generic terms about Mapuche language ideology and its connection to ritual and it is worth reiterating some of that analysis here as it offers clues as to the source of this ontological divergence between languages (Course, 2012). According to Mapuche understanding, language bears a force in excess of and beyond that of a speaker's intent. As my comadre María cautioned me frequently, "speech has force" ("*dungu niey newen*"), and this force is distinct from the speaker and frequently beyond her or his control. According to many Mapuche people, language has the capacity to effect results regardless of the speaker's intent, thus simply to voice an undesirable outcome can bring it into being. The ill and the young are particularly vulnerable to this kind of careless speech, in which voiced concerns may very easily become realized through their very vocalization. Therefore one should never mention the possibility of death with regards to a seriously ill person, nor should one mention any possible defect or abnormality with regards to a newborn child. To do so would run the risk of effecting the unwanted result. This conceptualization of the "force" (*newen* in Mapudungun or *fuera* in Spanish) of language is not restricted to accidental use, but forms an integral part of ideas about what could be called "magical" speech: curses, blessings, requests for permission to spirits, and so on (cf. Tambiah 1968). Language is neither personified, nor is its excess force understood to originate in some other agent; rather, it is itself understood as a process manifesting "nonconscious intentionality," an idea which will become clearer as we further explore Mapuche notions of force. From a Mapuche perspective then, language is something upon which speakers have at best a tenuous grasp. Their

---

<sup>3</sup> Such a view of language seems widespread throughout the Americas. See, for example, Basso, 1985; Cesarino, 2011; Déléage, 2009; Seeger, 1987; Smith, 1998; Townsley, 1993; and Witherspoon, 1977.

intended meanings are frequently subject to the malicious misrepresentations of others, but more significant than this is the “force” perceived to be intrinsic to language itself. To speak (*dungun*) is to try and align this force to one’s communicative or pragmatic intentions, while bearing in mind that any alignment of what is intended with the ultimate consequences of each utterance is at best contingent and partial. Although the term *newen* or “force” is frequently used in everyday conversation to refer to the physical force of a person or animal, it also used extensively to refer to a volitional multiplicity of forces inherent within and constitutive of the world (*mapu*) itself. This force is a continuous, albeit fluctuating, presence of which places, spirits, animals, illnesses, harvests, deformities, triumphs, and defeats may all be exemplars. As my friend Ramón once told me, “everywhere is force” (*kom püle newengey men*). Force is conceived as both singular and multiple; a particular place may be said to instantiate a particular *newen*, a force which may become further instantiated across a variety of forms: the productivity of the land, the spirit masters (*ngen* or *püllü*) resident in that place, any qualities good or bad inherent in the people born there, and so on. It is important to add here that there is no sense of a hierarchy of manifestations; a child’s deformity is not simply the result of a local spirit, nor is a spirit simply the result of the qualities of the people living in that place: all are equally manifestations of *newen*, a force which has no identity other than through its manifestations. To borrow a phrase from Nietzsche, “there is no ‘being’ behind doing, effecting, becoming; the ‘doer’ is merely a fiction added to the doing – the doing is everything” (2008 [1887]: XIII).

That language is said to have its own “force” is neither to personify it, nor to deny that it can serve the intentions of a speaker. Rather, it is to suggest that the excess or potentiality of language is of a kind, or continuous with, the essential force of which all things are instances. Both the farmer sowing his crops and the speaker enunciating utterances seek to engage with, utilize, and channel the “force” of things, of the earth and of semiotic potential, while remaining aware that neither the fertility of the earth nor the meaning of speech is ever fully within their control. It could be said that this deep and intimate relationship of language with force, of *dungu* with *newen*, is theoretically applicable to both Spanish and Mapudungun. Yet my understanding is that Mapudungun is understood to be somehow more embedded in the flow of *newen* than is Spanish. When I think about the contexts and statements I drew upon in reaching the position I described above, they were mainly concerned with Mapudungun rather than Spanish. The insistence on the use of Mapudungun in certain contexts, is, I suggest, premised on its perceived continuity with the “world” (*mapu*), an indexical rather than wholly arbitrary relationship like that constituted through Spanish.

And yet, to mobilize the distinction of symbol and index for an understanding of the distinction between Spanish and Mapudungun, while helpful in some regards, is probably not the best conceptualisation. This is because it is still grounded in an understanding of language as fundamentally about *meaning*. After all, a Peircean index still relies on a particular kind of relation to an interpretant and thus remains primarily concerned with meaning. For Mapuche people, Mapudungun bears meaning, for sure; but, as I hope to have illustrated, it also does much more than that. For no matter what analytical framework we utilise to address the issue, the key point is that Mapudungun always has an “excess,” a force irreducible to meaning.



What I would emphasise here is that the semiotic and non-semiotic (extra-semiotic?) aspects of Mapudungun are not held to be in a fixed and static relationship with each other, but rather, are configured in significantly different ways to those of Spanish, the “excess” of Mapudungun being far the greater.

## Conclusion

In this paper, I’ve argued that questions of linguistic difference need to be open to the possibility that the difference may not just be one of degree, but one of kind. In the context of language in the Amerindian imagination, the ontological possibilities for what language is take particular forms, structured as they are within particular cosmological understandings. But the broader point is not confined to South America alone. For as Bauman and Briggs’ (2003) recent engagement with the history of linguistics in the Western tradition has amply demonstrated, the hegemonic contemporary understanding of languages as all equivalent objects is the result of a distinctly modernist project, one perpetually threatening to come apart at the seams. As Kathryn Woolard’s work on multilingual ballots in San Francisco has revealed, even in such a modernist bastion as California, the idea that English is not entirely equivalent remains pervasive, if implicit (Woolard, 1989). As mentioned earlier, one possible conclusion for this kind of argument would be that “language” itself is a misleading category, that like Schneider’s (1968) assault on “kinship” or Lèvi-Strauss’s (1963) on “totemism,” it obscures a fundamental diversity of ultimately irreconcilable practices, that Mapudungun and Spanish are understood to be fundamentally different kinds of things. I hope to have made clear that, as other papers in this volume also demonstrate, such an argument would be but a partial truth. As I stated at the start of this paper, when we explore the difference between Mapudungun and Spanish, we are asking *both* whether Mapudungun and Spanish are two different kinds of the same thing, *and* we are asking if they are two different things (cf. Viveiros de Castro, 2004*b*). With ever accelerating language shift and a highly complex politics of language, it becomes harder and harder, and perhaps less productive, to insist upon the fundamental difference between the two. Nevertheless, it is the very fact that Mapudungun is not easily and nor every way equivalent to Spanish that is precisely the source of its value and importance for many Mapuche people. For Mapudungun is not simply the index of a particular social and ethnic identity, but, like Mapuche themselves, a very part of the land itself.

## Bibliography

- Bialecki, Jon. 2011. No Caller ID for the Soul: Demonization, Charisms, and the Unstable Subject of Protestant Language Ideology. *Anthropological Quarterly*, 84(3): 679–704.
- Basso, Ellen B. 1985. *A Musical View of the Universe: Kalapalo Myth and Ritual Performances*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Bauman, Richard, and Charles L. Briggs. 2003. *Voices of Modernity: Language Ideologies and the Politics of Inequality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1982. *Language and Symbolic Power* (trans. J. B. Thompson). Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Cesarino, Pedro de Niemeyer. 2011. *Oniska: poética do xamanismo na amazônia*. São Paulo: Perspectiva.
- Déléage, Pierre. 2009. *Le Chant de l'anaconda: l'apprentissage du chamanisme chez les Sharanahua (Amazonie occidentale)*. Nanterre: Société d'ethnologie.
- Course, Magnus. 2007. "Death, Biography, and the Mapuche Person" *Ethnos*, 72(1): 77-101.
2010. "Of Words and Fog: linguistic relativity and Amerindian ontology. *Anthropological Theory*, 10(3): 247-263.
2011. *Becoming Mapuche: person and ritual in indigenous Chile*. Champaign: University of Illinois Press.
2012. "The Birth of the Word: Language, Force, and Mapuche Ritual Authority." *HAU: Journal of Ethnographic Theory* 2(1):1-26.
- Crow, Joanna. 2013. *The Mapuche in Modern Chile: a cultural history*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida.
- Di Giminiani, Piergiorgio. 2012. *Tierras Ancestrales, Disputas Contemporáneas*. Santiago: Ediciones Universidad Católica de Chile.
- González, Marcelo. 2016. *Los mapuche y sus otros: Persona, alteridad y sociedad en el sur de Chile*. Santiago: Editorial Universitaria.
- Golluscio, Lucia. 2006. *El pueblo Mapuche: poéticas de pertenencia y devenir*. Buenos Aires: Editorial Biblos.
- Hill, Jane. 1986. "The refiguration of the anthropology of language." *Cultural Anthropology* 1(1): 89-102
- Holbraad, Martin & Martin Pedersen. 2017. *The Ontological Turn: an anthropological exposition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jensen, Casper Bruun. 2011. "Introduction: Contexts for a Comparative Relativism" *Common Knowledge*, 17(1): 1-12.
- Kroskrity, Paul. 2000. *Regimes of Language: ideologies, politics, and identities*. Santa Fe: SAR Press.
- Lévi-Strauss, Claude. 1963. *Totemism* (trans. R. Needham). Boston: Beacon Press.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. 2008 [1887]. *On the Genealogy of Morals: a Polemic*. Trans. Douglas Smith. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Schneider, David. 1968. *American Kinship: a cultural account*. Englewood: Prentice Hall.
- Seeger, Anthony. 1987. *Why Suyá Sing: A Musical Anthropology of an Amazonian People*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Smeets, Ineke. 2008. *A grammar of Mapuche*. New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Smith, David M. 1998. "An Athapaskan Way of Knowing: Chipewyan Ontology." *American Ethnologist* 25(3):412-432.
- Strathern, Marilyn. 1980. "No Nature, No Culture: The Hagen Case." In *Nature, Culture, and Gender*, edited by Carol P. MacCormack and Marilyn Strathern, 174-222. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tambiah, Stanley. 1968. "The Magical Power of Words" in *Man*, 3(2): 175-208.

- Townsley, Graham. 1993. "Song Paths: The Ways and Means of Yaminahua Shamanic Knowledge." *L'Homme* 33(126/128):449–468.
- Viveiros de Castro, Eduardo. 2004a. "Exchanging Perspectives: The Transformation of Objects into Subjects in Amerindian Ontologies." *Common Knowledge* 10(3):463–484.
- 2004b. "Perspectival Anthropology and the Method of Controlled Equivocation." *Tipiti: Journal of the Society for the Anthropology of Lowland South America*, 2(1): 3-22.
- Wagner, Roy. 1975. *The Invention of Culture*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Witherspoon, Gary. 1977. *Language and Art in the Navajo Universe*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Woolard, Kathryn. 1989. "Sentences in the Language Prison: the rhetorical structuring of an American language policy debate." *American Ethnologist*, 16(2): 268-278.
1985. "Language Variation and Cultural Hegemony: toward an integration of sociolinguistic and social theory." *American Ethnologist*, 12(4): 738-748.
- Woolard, Kathryn & Bambi Schieffelin. 1994. "Language Ideology" *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 23: 55-82.
- Zuniga, Fernando. 2000. *Mapudungun*. Munich: Lincom Europa.